

To: Members, Infrastructure & Environment Committee

Re: Item 2026.IE27.9 — Updates on Vision Zero Road Safety Initiatives (Community Safety Zones and the post-ASE environment)

Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on Item 2026.IE27.9 – Updates on Vision Zero Road Safety Initiatives. With the removal of Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) by the Province, the City has lost a proven speed-management tool. Staff are taking a prudent approach by pausing expansion of Community Safety Zones outside of school zones until more data is available regarding CSZ effectiveness without ASE.

During this transition period, school crossing guards, whose presence the City directly controls, remain one of the few immediate, human-based interventions that support children's safety at the exact time and place risk is highest. They also offer a practical interim measure while longer-term traffic-calming options are under review. Many infrastructure-based solutions such as roundabouts or speed humps require capital investment, design time, and consultation. In contrast, crossing guards can be low-cost, reliable, and immediately deployable, providing the City with a flexible safety tool during the period in which CSZ criteria and post-ASE strategies are being reassessed.

Carraway has worked with the City for several years and is currently responsible for two of Toronto's four crossing-guard zones. Across our current and previous contracts, we have managed operations at approximately 80% of all school-crossing intersections citywide, giving us deep operational knowledge of the program and a longstanding history as a reliable, transparent, and safety-focused partner.

Carraway's approach is not a single feature or software tool. It is a managed, integrated operating model that combines people, platform, and hardware into a reliable and auditable safety system:

1. People: Trained supervisors monitor real-time conditions, coach staff, and respond quickly to exceptions.
2. Platform: The platform we use provides real-time visibility, lateness prediction, automated backfill deployment, and immutable audit logs.
3. Hardware: A motion-activated fob paired with the crossing guard's mobile device provides two independent sources of verification for time-on-post and activity.

Carraway's system is unique because it integrates verification with supervision, exception management, operational planning, and audit-ready reporting. This combined system is especially relevant now, as the City reassesses what tools remain effective without ASE. We also wish to note that Carraway has the operational capacity and supervisory structure to support the City should staff determine that additional coverage is required in more complex or higher-risk locations created by the absence of speed cameras or while longer-term traffic-calming solutions are evaluated.

In alignment with staff's recommendations, we respectfully suggest that:

Transportation Services undertake a staff-led assessment of operational models now used in Toronto's crossing-guard program, including integrated models that combine supervision, real-time platforms, and physical verification to determine how they may contribute to interim school-zone safety while longer-term traffic-calming options are under review.

Carraway is prepared to participate in any staff-led assessment, demonstration, or evaluation, with full transparency should staff determine it would be useful.

In closing, we recognize that staff are actively assessing alternative approaches to school-zone safety now that automated speed enforcement is no longer available. It is our hope that Carraway can respond to that work by offering operational insight and experience where it may be helpful. We appreciate the Committee's leadership on this issue and stand ready to support staff in any further evaluation that advances Toronto's Vision Zero goals.

Thank you for considering our submission.

Greg Rzeplinski
Managing Partner
Carraway